

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

DRONE TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,)	Civil Action No. 2:14-cv-00111
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Judge Arthur J. Schwab
vs.)	
)	
PARROT S.A. and)	
PARROT, INC.)	ELECTRONICALLY FILED
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER OF COURT

AND NOW, this 15th day of January, 2015, upon consideration of Plaintiff Drone Technologies, Inc.'s Second Motion To Compel Damages Discovery (Doc. Nos. 150, 152), and Defendants' opposition thereto (Doc. No. 153), and all other matters presented to the Court,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion is **GRANTED**.¹

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that on or before January 22, 2015, at Noon, Defendants shall:

- i. Produce the damages documents outlined below, or specifically identify where in Defendants' prior productions such documents may be found:
 - a. All documents related to the financial performance of Defendants' drone business²;
 - b. Defendants' business plans, projections, forecasts, etc., related to its drone business;
 - c. All documents related to any of Defendants' licenses, licensing policies, or licensing practices;
 - d. All documents related to any royalties paid by Defendants for any technologies – drone or otherwise;
 - e. All documents related to any analysis of products competitive with Defendants' drone products;

¹ Defendants' request for a hearing is DENIED. See Doc. No. 153, pg. 15. The Court is very familiar with arguments related to the ongoing discovery disputes. See Doc. No. 106.

² Any references to Defendants' drones in this Order include Defendants' Bebop and MiniDrone models (See Doc. No. 145, ¶ 3).

- f. All documents related to any pricing decisions related to Defendants' drone products;
 - g. All documents discussing whether Defendants' absolute control mode functionality, accelerometer piloting mode functionality, or smart phone/tablet controlled drone piloting represents an improvement over other methods of piloting a drone; and
 - h. All documents discussing the impact of discontinuing Defendants' absolute control mode functionality, accelerometer piloting mode functionality, or smart phone/tablet controlled drone piloting;
- ii. Produce a competent 30(b)(6) witness on behalf of Defendants, in the office of Plaintiff's counsel in Pittsburgh, on January 28, 2015, at 9:00 AM, unless parties agree to a different day/time. See Doc. No. 153, pg. 14 (date proposed by Defendants);
- iii. Identify and remove (or pay for Plaintiff to remove) all irrelevant and nonresponsive documents within the production that interfere with Plaintiff's ability to locate and access relevant documents; and
- iv. Specifically identify which documents were produced in response to each request for production.

s/ Arthur J. Schwab
Arthur J. Schwab
United States District Court Judge

cc: All Registered ECF Counsel and Parties